



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,030	09/13/2000	Martin Page	36J.P284	8369

5514 7590 02/05/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
----------

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

6

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/661,030

Applicant(s)

PAGE ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lautmann (US006560644B1) and in view of Willie et al. (US006052724A).
3. With regard to *claims 1, 27, 53 and 79*, Lautmann reference discloses,
  - *detecting (polling) the presence of at least one of the plurality of network devices (SNMP capable devices) on the network by using a first communication protocol (SNMP);* (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65)
  - *obtaining, by using the first communication protocol, an information block (network address) from each of the detected network devices, wherein the information block contains information related to the corresponding network device;* (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65)

However, Lautmann reference does not explicitly disclose,

- *formatting each information block into a directory entry; and*

- *sending each directory entry to a directory server via a second communication protocol.*

Willie teaches,

- *formatting (invoking suitable functions) each information block into a directory entry (data module 66); and (Willie, col.8, lines 6-18; module 68, fig.2)*
- *sending each directory entry to a directory server (directory service 62) via a second communication protocol (distributed directory service, Novell Directory Services). (Willie, col.7, line 56 - col.8, line 2; col.8, lines 23-45; module 62, fig.2)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Willie reference with Lautmann reference to enable for managing a distributed directory service which uses standard management protocols to generate notifications of events occurring within the distributed service.

4. With regard to *claims 2-3, 28-29, 54-55 and 80-81*, Lautmann and Willie references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

*See claims 1, 27, 53 and 79 rejection as detailed above.*

Furthermore, Lautmann and Willie references disclose,

- *wherein the first communication protocol is a network management protocol. (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65; Willie, col.2, lines 24-51; col.3, lines 3-9)*

- *wherein the first communication protocol is SNMP.* (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65; Willie, col.2, lines 24-51; col.3, lines 3-9)

5. With regard to *claims 4-6, 30-32, 56-58 and 82-84*, Lautmann and Willie

references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 27, 53 and 79* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Lautmann and Willie references disclose,

- *wherein the second communication protocol is a directory-based protocol.*  
(Willie, col.7, line 56 - col.8, line 2; col.8, lines 23-45; module 62, fig.2)
- *wherein the second communication protocol is Lightweight Directory Access Protocol.* (Lautmann, col.3, lines 19-28; col.6, lines 21-46, lines 47-63; col.7, lines 1-16, lines 42-45)
- *wherein the second communication protocol is x.500 directory protocol.*  
(Lautmann, col.3, lines 19-28; col.6, lines 21-46, lines 47-63; col.7, lines 1-16, lines 42-45)

6. With regard to *claims 7-8, 33-34, 59-60 and 85-86*, Lautmann and Willie

references disclose the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claims 1, 27, 53 and 79* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Lautmann and Willie references disclose,

- *sending a broadcast query message in the first communication protocol;*  
*and* (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65)

Art Unit: 2143

- receiving a reply message in the first communication protocol from each of the plurality of network devices that supports the first communication protocol, (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65)
  - wherein, the reply message contains network identification information related to the corresponding network device that sent the reply message. (Lautmann, col.1, lines 61-65; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 2; col.2, lines 63-65)
7. With regard to *claims 9, 35, 61 and 87*, they include features or limitations as in *claim 1*. Thus, *claims 9, 35, 61 and 87* are also rejected under the same rational as cited in the rejection of the *claim 1* (see *claim 1* rejection as detailed above).
8. With regard to *claims 10-14, 23-25, 36-41, 49-51, 62-66, 75-77, 88-92 and 101-103*, they include features or limitations as in *claim 1*. Thus, *claims 10-14, 23-25, 36-41, 49-51, 62-66, 75-77, 88-92 and 101-103* are also rejected under the same rational as cited in the rejection of the *claim 1* (see *claim 1* rejection as detailed above).
9. With regard to *claims 15-21, 41-47, 67-73 and 93-99*, they include features or limitations as in *claim 7*. Thus, *claims 15-21, 41-47, 67-73 and 93-99* are also rejected under the same rational as cited in the rejection of the *claim 7* (see *claim 7* rejection as detailed above).
10. With regard to *claims 26, 52, 78 and 104*, they include features or limitations as in *claim 21*. Thus, *claims 26, 52, 78 and 104* are also rejected under the same

rational as cited in the rejection of the *claim 21* (see *claim 21* rejection as detailed above).

### **Conclusion**

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Stevens et al. (US006539425B1)
- Saito et al. (US006523696B1)
- Natarajan et al. (US006505244B1)
- Vaid et al. (US006502131B1)
- Nelson (US006292838B1)


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 703/305-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/872-9306 for regular communications and 703/872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

*Thomas Duong (AU2143)*

*January 31, 2004*



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100